UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,676	04/04/2006	Dennis Lee	PU60525	4094
20462 7590 08/20/2008 SMITHKLINE BEECHAM CORPORATION CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY-US, UW2220 P. O. BOX 1539			EXAMINER	
			RAHMANI, NILOOFAR	
	KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-0939		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/20/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

US_cipkop@gsk.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/574,676	LEE ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	NILOOFAR RAHMANI	1625		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 Ar</u> This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examinet 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ access Applicant may not request that any objection to the orecast to the content of the con	r election requirement. r. epted or b)⊡ objected to by the B drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/04/2006.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 are pending in the instant application.

Priority

2. This application was filed on 04/04/2006, which is a 371 of PCT/US2004/032824, file on10/06/2004, which claims benefit of 60/508,894 and claims benefit of 60/531,949, filed on 12/23/2003.

3. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement because the specification does not enable the instant compound to inhibit Rho-kinases and therefore to treat any and all known or unknown diseases. The claim contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the

Art Unit: 1625

level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

- 1) The breadth of the claims.
- 2) The nature of the invention,
- 3) The state of the prior art,
- 4) The level of one of ordinary skill,
- 5) The level of predictability in the art,
- 6) The amount of direction provided by the inventor,
- 7) The existence of working examples,
- 8) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The nature of the invention: The instant invention is drawn to method of inhibiting Rho-kinases comprising administering to a subject in need thereof a safe and effective amount of a compound according to claim 1.

The state of the prior art: At the time the invention was made, the scientific community was not certain of the activity of Rho-kinase inhibitors and the treatment of hypertension: "Rho-kinase inhibitors *may* have therapeutic benefits in patients with hypoxia-induced pulmonary hypertension." (Emphasis added). Takemoto et al., Circulation, (2002 Jul 2) Vol. 106, No. 1, pp. 57-62.

The predictability in the art: It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for

physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instantly claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that in regards to the therapeutic effects, whether or not the compounds of formula of claim 1 would be useful for treating a pharmacological condition in a subject.

Amount of guidance/working examples: Applicant provides no guidance for using a therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I) could treat any and all known or unknown diseases. Nor does applicant identify what diseases are treatable by therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I).

The breadth of the claims: The breadth of claims is drawn to method of inhibiting Rho-kinases comprising administering to a subject in need thereof a safe and effective amount of a compound according to claim 1.

The quantity of undue experimentation needed: Since the guidance and teaching provided by the specification is insufficient for treating diseases associated with therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I) is efficacious, one of ordinary skill in the art, even with high level of skill, is unable to use the instant compounds as claimed without undue experimentation.

The level of the skill in the art: The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity

Art Unit: 1625

by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Taking all of the above into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claims 3-6, for treating diseases associated with therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I) is efficacious, have been enabled by the instant specification.

4. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors

Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology

Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S.

patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before

November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Application/Control Number: 10/574,676

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a,e) as being anticipated by Bailey et al., WO 2003080610. Bailey et al. disclosed the instant claimed compounds, which from the STN search is

Page 6

RN 607373-85-3

CN 1,2,5-Oxadiazol-3-amine, 4-(1-ethyl-6-methoxy-1H-imidazo[4,5-c]pyridin-2-yl)-

RN 607373-97-7

CN 1,2,5-Oxadiazol-3-amine, 4-[1-ethyl-6-(methylthio)-1H-imidazo[4,5-

Art Unit: 1625

c]pyridin-2-yl]-

. Therefore, the instant claim is anticipated by Bailey et al.

5. Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a cancelled base claim 1 but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niloofar Rahmani whose telephone number is 571-272-4329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or public PAIR.

Art Unit: 1625

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/NILOOFAR RAHMANI/

08/11/2008

/D. Margaret Seaman/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625